

REMARKS

Please reconsider the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicant thanks the Examiner for carefully considering this application and for courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview conducted on June 8, 2007.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 3-10 are currently pending in this application. Claim 8 is independent. The remaining claims depend directly from claim 8.

Interview Summary

An Examiner Interview was conducted on June 8, 2007 ("Interview"). During the Interview, Applicant's representatives discussed with Examiner Kim how claim 1 requires a contact chip and a contactless chip disposed in a cavity. Further, Applicant's representatives discussed with Examiner Kim how U.S. Patent No. 6,440,773 ("Usami") fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned limitation. Specifically, Usami merely teaches a capacitor chip and fails to teach a contactless chip.

Examiner Kim agreed with the Applicant's representatives by stating that one of ordinary skill in the art could not reasonably construe a capacitor chip as a contactless chip. In view of this, Examiner Kim indicated that upon receipt of the instant response, he would withdraw the final Office Action mailed on April 3, 2007, conduct a new search, and either, issue a Notice of Allowance or a new non-final Office Action based on the results of the new search.

Rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C § 103**Claims 3 and 7-10**

Claims 3 and 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Usami. Claims 3, 7, and 9-10 depend from independent claim 8. To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

“To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness “...the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” (See MPEP §2143.03). Further, “all words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” (See MPEP §2143.03). The Applicant respectfully asserts that Usami fails to teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 8.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, “wherein a contact chip *and a contactless chip* are located in a cavity.” The aforementioned limitation explicitly requires a contactless chip paired with a contact chip in a cavity.

In contrast, as admitted by the Examiner during the Interview, Usami fails to teach or suggest the limitation of “a contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity,” as required by independent claim 8. (*see, e.g.*, Referenced Application, Figures 3 and 4). The cited portion of Usami, relied on by the Examiner as teaching a contactless chip, merely discloses a capacitor chip (4151) and a thin IC chip (4153) mounted on a neutral surface. (*see e.g.*, Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, p. 2 and Usami, col. 1, ll. 16-20). Thus, the Examiner initially assumed that a capacitor chip is equivalent to a contactless chip. (*see*, Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, p. 2). However, the Applicant respectfully submits that a capacitor chip cannot be equated with a contactless chip as taught by the claimed invention. As agreed to by the Examiner, one of ordinary skill in the art cannot reasonably construe the capacitor chip of Usami as a contactless

chip. Thus, Usami fails to teach or suggest a contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity as required by independent claim 8.

In view of the above, it is clear that Usami fails to render the claimed invention obvious. Thus, independent claim 8 is patentable over Usami for at least the above reasons. Dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 2

Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Usami in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,568,600 (“Carpier”). Claim 2 depends directly from independent claim 8. To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Usami does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 8. Further, Carpier does not teach that which Usami lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Carpier is only relied upon to teach “that the connecting means is a conductive track,” (*see* Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, pp. 3-4). Carpier is directed to provide an optimized connection that makes it possible to connect the conductive pins of a micromodule of a chip card to the ends of an antenna. (*see e.g.*, Carpier, col. 2, ll. 39-46). However, Carpier is completely silent with respect to a card that includes a contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity formed on the surface of the card. Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable over Usami and Carpier. Dependent claim 2 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 4

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Usami in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,566,163 (“Laroche”). Claim 4 depends directly from independent claim 8. To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Usami does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 8. Further, Laroche does not teach that which Usami lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Laroche is only relied upon to teach “that the connecting means is a metallic wire,” (*see* Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, p. 4). Laroche is directed to a contactless smart card where a gold wire is soldered to the chip contact pads. (*see e.g.*, Laroche, Abstract). However, Laroche is completely silent with respect to a card that includes a contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity formed on the surface of the card. Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable over Usami and Laroche. Dependent claim 4 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 5

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Usami in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001-0050138 (“Fujikawa”). Claim 5 depends from independent claim 8. To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Usami does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 8. Further, Fujikawa does not teach that which Usami lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Fujikawa is only relied upon to teach “that the connecting means is a liquid,” (*see* Office

Action mailed April 3, 2007, p. 5). Fujikawa is directed to an electronic circuit component electrically connected to an electric conductor pattern and fixed to a film by a fixing liquid. (*see e.g.*, Fujikawa, par. [0009]). However, Fujikawa is completely silent with respect to a card that includes contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity formed on the surface of the card. Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable over Usami and Fujikawa. Dependent claim 5 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Usami in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003-0183914 (“Wallace”). Claim 6 depends directly from independent claim 8. To the extent that this rejection applies to independent claim 8, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Usami does not teach or suggest all the limitations of independent claim 8. Further, Wallace does not teach that which Usami lacks. This is evidenced by the fact that Wallace is only relied upon to teach “that the chips are in a stacked configuration,” (*see* Office Action mailed April 3, 2007, p. 5-6). Wallace is directed to semiconductor memory chip packaging, and in particular to stacked multiple memory chip packages. (*see e.g.*, Wallace, par. [0004]). However, Wallace is completely silent with respect to a card that includes a contact chip *and a contactless chip* located in a cavity formed on the surface of the card. Accordingly, independent claim 8 is patentable over Usami and Wallace. Dependent claim 6 is patentable for at least the same reasons as independent claim 8. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant believes this reply is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 09669/056001).

Dated: June 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By  _____

Jonathan P. Osha
Registration No.: 33,986
OSHA · LIANG LLP
1221 McKinney St., Suite 2800
Houston, Texas 77010
(713) 228-8600
(713) 228-8778 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant